

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1973

Student Involvement in the Governance of Institutions of Higher Education and the Campus Unrest (A Study of University and College Officers' Views of Student Participation in Campus Governance)

Elliot Alfred Chand
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chand, Elliot Alfred, "Student Involvement in the Governance of Institutions of Higher Education and the Campus Unrest (A Study of University and College Officers' Views of Student Participation in Campus Governance)" (1973). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2149.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2149>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE GOVERNANCE OF INSTITUTIONS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CAMPUS UNREST

(A study of university and college officers' views of
student participation in campus governance)

by

Elliot Alfred Chand

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several people contributed their precious time and helpful suggestions so that this research could be completed. My very special thanks are extended to Dr. Terrance E. Hatch, chairman of the graduate committee, for his guidance, patience, and encouragement in planning and providing many key ideas over the course of the entire work.

Additional thanks go to members of the graduate committee for their helpful suggestions: Dr. Basil Hansen, Dr. Malcolm Allred, Dr. Robert Wininger and Dr. Yun Kim.

Others who cannot be left out and to whom my very sincere appreciation goes for their constant moral support and material assistance are Dr. Mrs. V. Kalyan Masih and Dr. Wilson W. Kalyan Masih.

The administrative officers from all the institutions involved in the study are commended for their cooperation and material assistance.

Finally, the deepest gratitude of a husband to his wife Beulah and of a father to his daughters, Deepika and Renuka, for their extended patience and solid support during the long period taken for the completion of this work.

Elliot A. Chand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
The Present Problem	2
Review of the Literature	2
Causes of student unrest	3
Need for student participation in college/university affairs	9
The character of academic free- dom has changed	14
The character of constitutional liberties has also changed	14
Student rights	15
Examples of student involvement	20
Some proposals for institutional governance involving students	26
II. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	30
Objectives of the Study	30
Sample	31
Instrumentation	33
Collection of Data	34
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	35
Extent of Student Participation in Campus Affairs	36
Extent of Student Participation Compared with Administrators Views on What Student Participation Should be in Institutional Affairs	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
III. (Continued)	
Student participation in administration	37
Curriculum and Instruction	47
Athletics and Extra-Curricular	54
Student Government, Student Control, and Auxiliary Services	58
Comparison between range of freedom in selected activities allowed by the in- stitutions and the range of freedom that the officials think they would allow students .	63
Degree of autonomy institutions allow com- pared to the degree of autonomy officials are willing to allow students in allocating funds for selected activities	
Effect of Student Involvement in Institutional Govern- ance on Student Protest and Demonstration . . .	71
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	73
Summary	73
Review of literature	73
General summary	74
Findings and Conclusions	76
Recommendations	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79
APPENDIX	82
VITA	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of questionnaires sent out to and returned by respondents from institutions classified by state and position held	32
2. Number of questionnaires sent and the number received back from the responding officers	35
3. Number of responses received in each of the five statements describing student participation	36
4. Student participation in the general administration of the institution as it exists now and what the officers think it should be	38
5. Extent of student participation in committees on curriculum and instruction under existing institutional policy and the respondents' views in regard to participation	48
6. Extent of present participation in committees on athletics and extra curricular activities and what the respondents would like it to be	55
7. Institutional policies and views of administrative officers on student participation in student government, student control and auxiliary services	59
8. Range of freedom allowed under existing institutional policy and the responding officers' views as to how much range should be allowed	64
9. Degree of autonomy for use of funds under existing policy and the responding officers' views	68

ABSTRACT

Student Involvement in the Governance of Institutions
of Higher Education and the Campus Unrest
(A study of university and college officers' views of
student participation in campus governance)

by

Elliot Alfred Chand, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 1973

Major Professor: Dr. Terrance E. Hatch
Department: Educational Administration

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of student participation in various aspects of college and university governance in contrast to the extent to which selected administrative officers would allow them to participate.

Objectives of the Study

1. To determine what the opinion of the university officials is on the general scope of student involvement in university affairs and institutional governance.
2. To determine the extent to which students are and should be involved in areas of administration including general governance, as viewed by the officers

included in this study.

3. To compare the latitude of freedom that students should have in the opinion of the selected officers regarding class attendance, and academic and non-academic life of the pupils with the extent of freedom that students are allowed under the existing institutional policies.

4. To determine the degree of autonomy that students should have in the opinion of the officers in the sample, regarding use of student activity fund as against the degree of autonomy that is given to students under the present school policies.

5. To ascertain if university officials responding to the questionnaire think that greater involvement in the total institutional governance would reduce tension on college and university campuses.

Findings

There is a general agreement among the responding officers that students must be allowed to get more involved in a variety of curricular and extra curricular activities both on the campus and off the campus.

The study found that in some administratively organized important councils and committees, particularly administrative boards (Board of Trustees/ Board of Higher Education) and Budget Committees students are not allowed to participate in any recognizable degree. Most school officials in this sample group were willing to give the students more voice in these areas of school administration than the institutions presently allow.

The freedom that students have under the present policy rules of these selected institutions with regard to the criteria developed for student performance, planning a field of study and class attendance etc., is both restrictive as well as limited in many institutions included in this study. The views of the responding officers obtained through the questionnaire revealed that they were willing to give students more voice in these areas of governance.

In an attempt to find out the degree of autonomy that students have and should have in the use of student activity fund, it was found that considerable autonomy is provided under the present institutional policies, so that students could use the allocated appropriation with great freedom. There was general agreement on the part of the administrative officers with the existing policies and practices.

So far as the reduction of tension around the campus was concerned officials believed that greater overall student involvement in college/university governance would reduce it to some extent, but in no case would this solve the problem of student protest and demonstrations on campus totally.

(94 pages)

CHAPTER I

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Student unrest and demonstrations on university and college campuses, all over the world, have become a common phenomena. These activities showing rebelliousness, are not limited to the jurisdiction of educational institutions alone and are directed not only toward the administrators of these institutions but have been significantly effective in politics also. Students have been involved in overthrowing governments. In 1960 student demonstrations were basically responsible for the overthrow of the Syngman Rhee regime. In 1964 student demonstrations were connected to the downfall of the governments in Bolivia, South Vietnam and Sudan. In the late 1960's students tended to establish a united front in challenging administrative policies in all spheres of educational, social, economic and political life of a country.

The seriousness of the situation is being increasingly recognized. Everywhere educators, psychologists, sociologists, politicians and even lay people have been trying to identify reasons for this type of student behavior.

This study analyzes the view of university and college officers in the states of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming regarding student participation in several phases of university and college life and institutional administration.

The Present Problem

The extent of student participation and the extent to which college administrators are willing to allow students to participate in university governance is not known.

Review of the Literature

Specific literature in relation to the problem under study is very limited. The following review presents the general level of concern and thinking of those persons who have viewed the problem of student unrest in the context of this study of student involvement in university/college administration.

References included in this review show a direct relationship with the study and encompasses some important causes of student rebellion, fallacies about the situation, opinions as to why students need more freedom, greater autonomy and closer partnership in the common pursuit of attainment of higher education.

In an educational institution the administration, the teaching faculty, the students, other support staff and work force, must all work together cooperatively for the achievement of institutional goals. Since goals particularly concern students, institutional policies must relate to students who form the largest segment of the school community. Mutual understanding and the need for closer relationship between students and administration will aid in the

achievement of institutional objectives. Freedom and opportunity to learn must be shared by all members of the academic community. In a free and democratic country conditions must be provided for free and mutually respectful teaching learning relationships. Administrators must accept the basic responsibility of safeguarding this freedom for each and every participating member of the community. Included in this responsibility is the need to avoid any infringement on the rights and interests of all concerned.

The American Council on Education's Special Committee on Campus

Riots states:

The process of academic governance, especially those that determine and establish institutional policies must be seen by all major groups concerned as essentially fair. Due process must be enlarged to include broad participation in the deliberations on important issues. If any part of the academic community feels that its interest in a proposed institutional policy has not been fairly represented and heard, the new policy is likely to be challenged. Trustees, administrators and faculty have as great a stake in effecting institutional change as do students. Reform of the college is a shared responsibility requiring attitudes that encourage educational change by all of the campus constituents.¹

Causes of student unrest

In most institutions the administration has not included students in institutional governance. Reasons forwarded are student immaturity, inexperience and incapability to make important decisions concerning administrative policies.

¹Chronicle of Higher Education, April 27, 1970, p. 3.

This type of attitude certainly shows great lack of confidence between students and the establishment and a very superficial relationship between the two.

This indifferent, as well as negative attitude of the heads and other faculty members creates a polarization. This distance, devoid of any close relationship, has created what we may call a "communication gap".

Students have been raising their united voice because of a deep feeling that they have been made anonymous by the colleges and the universities.

The administration, in student opinion, does not seem to be inclined to hear them or pay any attention to what they have to say on the matter of their own education. On this issue there is a solidarity that has developed among the students in most schools of higher education. According to Lipset:

The students at Cal (University of California, Berkeley) have united. To discover the basic issues underlying their protest, one must first listen to the speeches made by their leaders.

Two of the most basic themes that began to emerge in the very first speeches of the protest and that have remained central throughout have been a condemnation of the university in its role as a knowledge factory and a demand that the voices of the students must be heard. These themes have been so well received because of the general feeling among the students that the university has made them anonymous; and they have very little control over their environment, over their future; that the university society is almost completely unresponsive to their individual needs. The students decry the lack of human contact, the lack of communication, the lack of dialogue that exists at the university.

The students' basic demand is a demand to be heard, to be considered, to be taken into account when decisions concerning their education and their life in the university community are being made.²

Students claim that the administrators are too authoritarian, bureaucratic and too much concerned with their own personal interests rather than those of the students. Trustees and administrators are confronted with managerial, fiscal and governmental responsibilities so much that they have very little time left for academic responsibilities and concern for students. Heads and senior faculty members are in most cases, too busy with proposals, programs and projects which bring more grants to the institution for research. Research and consultation work leave no time for members of the faculty to teach and to advise students in the manner expected by the students.

Professor Frederick Haehnlen of the College of Education, University of Hawaii, writes in this connection as follows:

The Professoriat: Grantsmanship, research contracts and consultation fee have been the key words of the post sputnik vocabulary of the jet-age professor. The student and his concern have a very low priority in some professors' schemata of life. It appears we have created a situation where there is less and less teaching done by those who are primarily hired to teach and counsel students.³

²Seymour Martin Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin, The Berkeley Student Revolt (Anchor Books: Doubleday and Co, New York, 1965), pp. 222-223.

³Frederick Haehnlen, Student Unrest: The "P" Factor Theory (University of Hawaii, Honolulu: Phi Delta Kappa, University of Hawaii Center College of Education), p. 5.

Research and consultations are not only financially lucrative to the members of the faculty but they certainly lead to higher academic promotions also, and therefore take precedence over teaching. The placement of teaching and counseling students in the secondary role in the professions priority schemes leaves the students most unhappy and frustrated.

Another notable aspect in the present set up of the universities and colleges where trustees and board members come from the business community gives clear indications that these institutions can become a lucrative industry for them.

Dr. Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., talking about a number of shams in the present society, refers to the above situation rather forcefully, when he says:

Of all the shams young people present most obviously are those perpetrated by American colleges and universities - the sham that these colleges and universities are independent, inner directed institutions, when in fact, many of them in many ways are manipulated by both government and business; the sham that they exist for the benefit of their students, when in fact, one inviolable principle on which they conduct their affairs is the comfort and profit of their senior faculty members.⁴

Of course, there is much talk about the political consciousness of the present younger generation which has sufficiently been aroused and the unrest on campuses has in part resulted from this awakening. Students now understand better the meaning of freedom, equality, liberty and personal rights. When these rights are not granted to them, for whatever reasons, unrest is inevitable. All

⁴Vincent Barnett, Jr. Confrontation, Catalyst of Consensus, Speech delivered at the Convention of Association of College and University Housing Officers, (Boston, Mass, July 1969), p. 12.

authoritative control, direction and surveillance of student activities as well as all kinds of restrictions make the university government a little too dictatorial and the administration seems too autocratic. Students feel subjected to undue authority and their college experience gives them a lasting sense that the establishment in these institutions have bungled everything.

Dr. Robert Shaefer of the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, speaking before the 28th Annual Superintendent's Work Conference in New York, emphasized the above fact and its implications. He said that using administrative power cavalierly was to invite support and sympathy of the many for those against whom the administrator's ire might be directed. The feelings of students are well indicated from the excerpts of a document found in the men's room of the Low Library following the police removal of revolutionary students from the building:

Look there are certain truths that no one can deny. Everybody is created good and beautiful and equal. So we're as great as anybody else in this sick culture, and probably a lot better. Secondly, everybody has their rights, lots of them, and no one on earth, not even a professor or a mother, has any business interfering with any of them. Among these is the right to life, a big, full beautiful life - without middle class hang-ups like money, responsibility, examination and grades, the Puritan ethics, military service and pressures.

Another is liberty, the right to come and go as you please, without the government manipulators, crummy businessmen, religious spooks, uptight parents, the CIA, the sadistic cops and really out of it college administrators imposing their totalitarianism. Also there is the pursuit of happiness, the moral right to have fun time, to blow your mind, to sleep around, to turn on, however and whenever you like - so long as you don't interfere with anybody else.

Now its only because you sometimes have to protect these rights from right wing idiots and jocks that governments have any right to exist at all. But politicians and everybody in authority must be totally and at every minute responsible to the people in the streets and the students. That's where all power comes from. As soon as government or authority of any kind starts pushing people around or impinging on any liberties with their decrees, the people have a perfect right to tear down their power structure and build a better one based on love and total freedom.⁵

Dr. Edmond W. Gordon of the Teachers College, Columbia University, speaking of Relevance and Revolt, explains student revolt as a justified political movement and not symptomatic of personal problems of the generation gap. He says,

Students are an oppressed class systematically kept out of the labor force by military obligations and higher education, have legitimate complaints against the universities whose interests have become intertwined with those of business and government.⁶

This political motivation has certain basic factors behind it which are significant and bear sufficiently heavy weight to support student revolt. The draft and the Vietnam War have been vehemently opposed by the students. It is an obvious fact that in the country's military involvement the young people have lost the most.

⁵Robert J. Shaefer, Campus Unrest and Exhausted Administrator (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College), p. 8.

⁶Edmund W. Gordon, Relevance and Revolt (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, 1969), in "Abstract".

There is further frustration arising out of the many discrepancies that the young people notice around them. Colleges and universities profess worthwhile social goals like equality, fraternity, world peace and brotherhood, but what do students see happening? There is ugliness of racism instead of human unity and human dignity. There is social inequality, hate, class, war and political strifes all around. Billions of dollars are spent on moon trips while almost one third of America's population does not get two square meals a day. Labor unions are recognized for collective negotiations but students are shot when they react collectively.

Need for student participation in college/university affairs

College education is no longer the privilege of the elite and the rich of the society, but has become a 20th century imperative for social and economic mobility among all classes and a matter of national pride and necessity. The affluence of the post World War II American society has led to a tremendous increase in the enrollment of most schools of higher education, especially the universities. The present figures have crossed the seven million mark as against 2.5 million students enrolled in colleges and universities in 1948.

This great influx of students is a responsible factor for several problems that institutions are facing today. These include large classes with a large number of students in them, overloaded faculty, impersonal pupil-teacher

relationships and an absence of active student participation and involvement.

This situation has been responsible for the feeling of alienation that the students have developed and the sense of great loss of democratic cooperation of all the components of the college and university world.

Students demand that they must have a voice in the matters that concern them most - the matter of their education. At the recent opening of a hearing of the President's Commission on Student Unrest, held July 16, 1970, in Washington, D. C., Charles F. Palmer, President of the National Students Association said that the real cause of student unrest stemmed more from (a) the refusal of college administrators to give students a voice in their affairs and (b) a tendency to treat them like children.⁷

In his address at the symposium on "Academic Freedom and Responsibility,"⁸ held at California State College, Los Angeles, Dr. Louis Joughin, Associate Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, very clearly indicated that for the effective functioning of an institution of higher education, it is very necessary that all the components, viz. the trustees, the administration, the faculty, and the students, fulfill their responsibilities. Students he asserts, will not be able to fulfill their responsibilities for self-development unless they are allowed some rights and freedoms. Institutions

⁷UPI, Student Dissent Panel Agree on Few Points, Deseret News, Salt Lake City, July 16, 1970.

⁸AAUP Publication No. ED 034 479, Washington, D. C., May 22, 1968.

should provide three things in order to facilitate student involvement:

1. More information exchange.
2. More consultation with students .
3. Giving students decision making responsibility in many areas of university life and complete responsibility for some areas of student life.

Students are consumers of institutional services and therefore, should be heard on all academic matters which concern them. Joughin emphasizes that there is no other group better qualified to improve the colleges and universities than the students themselves.⁹

Students of the present era are much too different from the image of students that most of us of the older generation carry in our minds. These youngsters are much more informed because of the great explosion of knowledge and technical and scientific progress; they are much more independent and psychologically and mentally more mature as compared with the youth of the 1920's and 1930's. They insist that they want better returns from their investment in education and know better what they need.

At the Kettering Foundation Conference held in New York in July, 1968, under the auspices of the Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, twenty four college and university presidents discussed the subject of student

⁹ Lewis Joughin, Role of Students in College and University Governance, AAUP, May 22, 1968.

unrest. They recognized the need for improvement in student-administrator relationships. They made a distinction between a large number of students who advocate liberal reforms on the campus and the small minority attempting to exploit the unrest for destructive purposes. Dr. Samuel B. Gould, Chancellor of the State University of New York, emphasized the need for enlarging direct contact with students. Dr. Martin Jenkins of Morgan State College, Baltimore, accepted the fact that he was able to learn from the students. There may be issues beyond the control of the university but an exchange of ideas was better than "a flat footed stance against any dialogue on non-campus questions". Even in the matter of recruitment of students for military service or defense industries, many presidents did not see any reason why students should not be permitted full representation on councils responsible for such decision making.¹⁰

It was also felt that if it were not for the fact that many governing boards were resistant to any fundamental strengthening of student participation in university affairs, college presidents would be in a far better position to deal with the basic causes of student unrest.

The conclusion that one can draw from the deliberations of this conference was a conceivable fact that the administration and the students form a natural alliance and the understanding of the student position that these officials

¹⁰Saturday Review, "College Presidents and Student Unrest," July 27, 1968.

showed at the conference was a tribute to them and a positive factor in the assessment of the problem in the area of higher education.¹¹

To a disturbed climate on a campus, a board of trustees would respond in one of the following approaches according to James L. Chapman, Associate Dean of Students, University of Iowa:

1. The confrontation approach in which the governing board would firmly assert its power under all circumstances upholding established policies regardless of the situation. The psychological frame of reference from which such a board would operate is that of insecurity, distrust, rigidity and coercion.

2. The confused approach in which the governing board acts without proper knowledge as to what its role should be in such matters. Its policies would be uncertain. The board would think that some action has to be taken but would not be sure of it. The psychological climate in this approach would be that of uncertainty, frustration and the need for activity.

3. The confidence approach in which the board would consider the problem in the light of reason and good judgment. It would place confidence in the president and his administrative staff to work out satisfactory solutions to such problems. The board would resist pressure from all interested groups - administration, faculty, dissenting students and the public - to act with haste or unfairness in dealing with the problem. The psychological attitude of the board would be one of security, trust, openness, and confidence.¹²

This third model should be acceptable to a stable board of trustees and for that matter to all concerned including the students. It fits into the changes that have occurred in our society.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 18.

¹² "The Board of Trustees and Student Behavior," School and Society, October 26, 1968, pp. 363-364.

The character of academic
freedom has changed

The AAUP statement of 1915 indicated that academic freedom was the freedom of the teacher to teach in his own area of competency. The most recent statement which was drafted in 1964 stipulates both the freedom for the teacher to teach and the freedom of the student to learn.

The character of constitutional
liberties has also changed

The racial "separate but equal" law was upheld as valid in 1896. The Supreme Court declared this same law as unconstitutional in 1954. A New York State Court of Appeals (1917) upheld the dismissal of a student from a State College because the student did not conduct himself off-campus in patriotic manner. The decision in Dixon vs. the State of Alabama (1963) was in favor of the students since the college from which the students were dismissed did not follow the basic tenets of due process.

A changed approach, therefore, of a board of trustees from firm assertion of its power to establishing trust, openness, security, confidence, and understanding in working with the entire academic community will go a long way in coping with stressful situations.¹³

¹³ James L. Chapman, "The Board of Trustees and Student Behavior," School and Society, October 26, 1968, p. 363.

Dr. Orville W. Johnston, Assistant to the President, State University of New York, A and T College at Alfred, New York, in his article "Amnesty vs. Order on College Campuses," states that:

The only logical course for a college or university administration to follow currently is a policy of complete open-mindedness to honest demonstrators or dissenters, who are willing to discuss problems within the university system. Most administrators know that the present system is far from perfect and are anxious for its improvement.¹⁴

Dissent, debate and dialogue are excellent means for working change and improvement. Destruction, disorder and disruption of other's rights are self-defeating to the cause which instigate them.

Student rights

The joint Statement of Academic Freedom of Students issued by the representatives of the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the National Students Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, referred to earlier, proposes a number of essentials for student freedom.

It proposes that the American colleges and universities should adopt a policy of open admissions so that all students, and especially those from racial

¹⁴O. W. Johnston, "Amnesty vs. Order on College Campuses," School and Society, October 26, 1968, p. 365.

minorities, may have equal chance and access to higher education. The students should have freedom to express their views in the classroom and in the student publications. Students must be free to organize or join an association in order to promote their common interests. They must be allowed to participate in the formulation and application of institutional policy. They should have the freedom to exercise their rights both on and off the campus as any other citizen.

In the preamble of this statement it is clearly mentioned that:

The responsibility to secure and to respect general conditions conducive to the freedom to learn is shared by all members of the academic community. Each college and university has a duty to develop policies and procedures which provide and safeguard this freedom. Such policies and procedures should be developed at each institution within the framework of general standards and with the broadest possible participation of the members of the academic community.¹⁵

A minimal document of freedoms that the joint statement provides does cover a wide range of student life during his educational career at the college. Some of them are paraphrased below:

1. Freedom of access to higher education: Precluding any interpretation of preferential treatment to any group or community it provides for equal opportunity to everyone going in for higher education - race, religion, social status or any other factor should never be a bar to college admission.

¹⁵ Jane E. Matson, "Statement on Student Rights," Junior College Journal Vol. 38, November 1967. Joint Statement published with this article, p. 40.

2. In the classroom: Free discussion, free inquiry, and free expression must be encouraged. Evaluation of student work performance must be done purely on academic basis and not on impressions of student conduct and behavior. There should be no punishment to students for their views. Grading should be non-arbitrary and students must be protected from such an evaluation.
3. Student Record: No record of student's political activities should be kept. To protect the institution against legal suits, disciplinary records may be kept but they should be destroyed from time to time. Academic and disciplinary records to be kept separately.
4. Student Affairs: Certain standards are to be maintained. Students should be free to organize and join associations to promote their common interests. The membership, policies and actions of a student organization to be determined by vote of only those who are bonafide members of the college or university community. Student organization should be free to choose its own advisors and institutional recognition should not be withheld or withdrawn because of any organization's inability to secure an advisor. The campus advisor should not have the authority to control the policy of such an organization.

Affiliation with an extramural should not of itself disqualify a student organization from institutional recognition. Student organizations including those affiliated with an extramural organization, should be open to all students without respect to race, creed or national origin.

5. Student rights safeguarded: There must be definite safeguards for students rights in investigation of his conduct - insurance against search of his dormitory room and belongings without his knowledge and consent except in extreme emergency - nor harassment to coerce admission of crime and guilt. Pending action on the charges, a student's status should not be changed. A streamlined procedure of hearing, devoid of all partiality and biases, should be set up in which students' rights are properly safeguarded.¹⁶

Students have inconvertible rights in the educational process among which are the right to quality education, to equality and fairness of treatment, and to representation in case of unfair judgment against them. Administrations must recognize these rights not only in the interest of the students but in the total interest of the institution.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 40-41.

Mayhew writing in this connection says:

Virtually every student uprising during the last four years has been caused because an administrator denied students procedural rights - Behind every successful student outbreak stands some administrator who exercised discretion without legitimacy. Properly structured grievance procedure and procedural rights could have kept grievances within legitimate bounds.¹⁷

Don F. Anders making a study of student activists and their characteristics, their nationwide impact and the possible extension of their influence from university to junior college suggests that administrators must prepare them by understanding the reasons for their demands and adopting policies to prevent violence. Clear grievance procedures and recognition of due process would head off most disruptions. He further adds that administrators must learn more about the student's academic life as well as private life, must appreciate non-cognitive and non-verbal behavior. He must drop his authority in loco parentis, cultivate trust in the student and grant him more voice in the planning of his future.¹⁸

For the administrator, the teacher and the student academic freedom is the basis of educational success. This freedom does not give any one of them the right to deprive the other from his exercise of the academic freedom.

¹⁷ Lewis Mayhew, "Quotes on Dissent," Phi Delta Kappan 40(1):19, 1968.

¹⁸ Don F. Anders, Proposed Junior College Administrative Action and Reaction to the Student Activist, Seminar Paper, Office of HEW, Washington, D. C.

When this freedom is not ensured by any action of any member of the academic community then the institution itself will retard the growth.

Examples of student involvement

There is a strong and definitive move toward involving students in a more responsible way in institutional governance. Students have been demanding this privilege and a large number of educators, educational associations and other bodies of scholars have supported the move by presenting a number of suggestions and examples of participatory democracy in university and college policies. A number of institutions have already initiated student representation on various committees and councils both in the curricular and extra curricular areas.

According to a survey made by the Association of State Colleges and Universities, the pervading focus of concern among state colleges and universities has been to find out ways and means of dealing with student frustration and unrest. In many cases, this has taken the form of giving student representation on key faculty and administrative committees.¹⁹

The following examples are cited from the above mentioned survey.

At Radford College (Va.), students will serve on nine faculty committees.

At State College, Westfield (Mass.) three standing committees (executive, curriculum and discipline) will have student representatives.

¹⁹Oster and Otten, "Fresh Developments at the State Higher Education Institutions," School and Society, January 20, 1968, pp. 48-49.

Eastern and Northern Montana Colleges are increasing existing student representation on faculty and administrative committees.

Shippensburg State College (Pa.) has put students on its curriculum committee.

Louisiana Polytechnic Institute will place students on all committees within the division of Student Affairs, and plans to group all student organization presidents into a council to meet monthly with the dean of students, and has adopted a procedure for the release of student personnel records.

West Texas State University has set up a new committee consisting of five students, five administrators, and five faculty members, "to give greater visibility to student views".

At Henderson State College (Ark.) the presidents of all student organizations meet monthly with the student personnel dean, the dean of instruction, and the college president.

Jackson State College (Miss.) has established a new faculty committee "to enhance student life".

California State College, Fullerton has two-day faculty student retreats of the representatives to improve communications.

At another survey made by Milton Ohmer in Knoxville, Tennessee of the institutions of higher education it was found that:

At the University of Tennessee, students have been serving on disciplinary committees of the Administrative Council. They hold equal voting rights with the staff on these committees.

From the Spring of 1966 to the Fall of 1967 students has served on an ad hoc committee on Academic Integrity appointed by the University of Tennessee Senate.

They had equal voting rights with faculty members. Early in the Fall of 1967, the president of the Student Government Association was seated with vote on the Senate of the University of Tennessee. For several years the colleges of Agriculture and Business Administration have had students committees serving in advisory capacities.

In Knoxville College, students serve with vote on a variety of extra curricular committees. They are appointed by the president of the Student Union. Student representatives also serve on curriculum committee without vote. They are appointed by the president of the Student Union.

At Maryville College, during a wide scale revision of the entire curriculum, student committee supplied ideas and suggestions to faculty committees.

Tennessee Technological University: During the school year 1966-67, under the auspices of the Associated Student Body, students conducted an evaluation of faculty members via a questionnaire and published the results. Students also serve on a variety of extra curricular committees. They are appointed by the Associated Student Body.²⁰

At Carson Newman College, students have served in an advisory capacity over the years on extra curricular committees.

Eileen Hein of the Oregon's Lane Community College, describing a case for student involvement, reported that students at Lane were involved in decision making that is of profound importance to the institution. The student body president finds that in his interaction with the administration and faculty, his views have always been counted. He says:

²⁰ U.S. Dept. of HEW, Washington, D. C. Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making. Project No. 7-D-037, Pub. No. ED 024 332, May 1968, p. 9.

These people do listen to me. I have come from the back of the room to the front. It's a personal challenge and I know I have contributed. Learning depends on human interaction. As President I have learned more about people than subject matter; at the same time academics took new meaning.²¹

The Lane Community College has a coed on the Academic Council representing the students. This girl made the following comments:

I started cold to see what student government was like. Topics before the Council include decisions on credit for courses by examination, waivers for physical education, and questions involving student military service. We make recommendations to the curriculum committee too. These policy decisions affect students and I feel that I represent them in direct communication. I often find myself clarifying students' reasons to the Council. This brings closer relations within the school. After all what is the school if it isn't students? We justify our requests by participating and showing that our ideas are worthy.²²

Another student, Gary McNabb, who was elected president of the Oregon State Community College's Student Association, has expressed:

When student faculty administration and the board are truly invested there will be no desire for revolution. Our lives will reflect this opportunity.²³

The majority of the population of Oregon's community colleges has decided that student participation in academic decisions is a positive factor for

²¹ Eileen Heim, A Case for Student Involvement, Junior College Journal, Vol. 38, February 1958, p. 42.

²² Ibid., p. 44.

²³ Ibid., p. 44.

personal, institutional and community growth. The students themselves make it clear that participation in important decision making favorably affects the attitudes about formal education.

Another example of student involvement at the University of Pennsylvania is in order. President Gaylord P. Harnwell calls this student move "a quiet revolution" carried out without any malice or militancy, where students have been ushered into the 'corridors of power', and where they wield more control over their destinies than students at other schools of similar size. The Time, March 15, 1968, reported that the most effective aspect of this revolution was a report issued by a self-appointed student committee on undergraduate education in 1966. In response to this report, the administrators approved many changes recommended in the report, e.g. allowing students to take one course a semester on a 'pass fail' basis, letting them fashion their own individualized major and inviting them to sit on curriculum committees. A group of twenty administrators and teachers and twenty students consider other relevant issues in a monthly meeting. This forum includes the University President, four undergraduate college deans and other top officials. Students also participate in the selection of a new dean of men, a dean of women, and the dean of the college of Arts and Sciences. Separate student courts, both men and women, deal with the infractions of undergraduate regulations. Visiting rights and coed dormitory hours are decided by a ten-student, ten-teacher committee. This committee extended women's curfew to 1:30 A.M. on week days and 2:15 A.M. on weekends. It also gave men the right to entertain girls in their rooms until

2:00 A.M. on weekends. There is also a student-run traffic court and a student board that enforces the campus honor code. The campus courts are so firmly established that when a faculty committee tried to discipline students who interfered with the recruiters of Dow Chemicals in November 1967, the university, on demand from the students, handed the case to the student judiciary. As a result of this a special commission including six student was created for drafting a policy on demonstrations. Students are rather proud of this revolution and say "while Berkeley students used confrontation, Penn students used communication, consensus and compromise."²⁴

Kathlene R. Mock of American Psychological Association, when speaking at the Association's convention at San Francisco in August, 1968, pointed out that two-thirds of the Berkeley group at the convention had agreed that students should participate significantly in the content and organization of the courses, academic policy decisions and matters of this sort, and the students should be given all freedom in choosing their own subjects of study and their own areas of interest within these subjects.

A large number of other examples can be cited to support the view that there is a strong move on the part of institutions to involve more and more students and faculty members in all different areas of college-university government.

²⁴The Time, New York, March 15, 1968.

Some proposals for institutional
governance involving students

The Joint Student Faculty Committee set up by the University of California, Berkeley, in January 1967, released a long 250 page report in January 1968. Indiscriminate in its criticism, the report blamed the university president for failing to give each campus enough autonomy, and Berkeley Chancellor Roger Heyns for not developing a meaningful dialogue with the faculty. Too many students it says, displayed "an appalling high rate of disaffection and disinterest"²⁵ toward their own education.

Some of the proposals from this report are paraphrased below.

The basic solution that the committee proposed for the problem was decentralization in order to weave students, faculty and administrators into community seeking common goals. It recommended that administrators delegate as much authority as is possible to local campuses. A proposal, for example, was made that the College of Letters and Science at Berkeley be broken into small colleges grouped around related disciplines, each with power to hire and promote teachers. Students should sit on the key committees within departments to help shape policy and would also help evaluate the teaching of the professors. The local constituencies would then feed into a more representative and entirely reorganized student government and academic faculty senate.

²⁵Time, January 1969, p. 34.

Instead of the chancellor directly administering discipline, the committee suggested that a new set of campus regulations, subject to the chancellor's vote should be drawn up by a rules committee representing faculty, students and administration. Violators would be brought to a judgment before a student conduct court composed of four students and four faculty members.²⁶

Charles C. Collins, writing on Student Rights and Due Process in the Junior College Journal, April 1967, states that the college, the students, the aims of democratic education, the principles of justice, all would be served if structural means were developed by which (a) students had a voice in policy recommendations to the governing board, and (b) students who felt sinned against by administration or by faculty could, with impunity, present their case to an impartial panel for adjudication. He proposes that students be included in the debate on policy recommendations affecting them. Their channels to the governing board could and should be the existing channels; let them serve along with administration and faculty on the curriculum and instruction committee, the student personnel committee, and the policies and procedures committee. On matters specific to the students let the student senate speak directly to the board of trustees just as in matters specific to the faculty, the faculty now speaks. The companion proposal to student involvement in policy formulation is that of

²⁶Time, January 1969, p. 34.

respecting students as full members of the academic community by assuring them the protection of due process.²⁷

Another plan, more on the lines of a political set-up has been proposed by Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr. of the State University of New York at Buffalo.²⁸ The gist of this suggested design is that the central administration is conceived as occupying a position analogous to that of the federal executive. This central administration would include the president and his related administrators. The legislature is conceived of as a two house system involving students and the faculty. Faculty senate to be conceived as the representative body and the Students Assembly as the lower house in the legislature. The lower house (Student Assembly) would be relatively larger and would enjoy some special powers, for example, the initiation of all bills pertaining to the regulation of student conduct. The two houses will be connected by the familiar machinery of conference committees, joint commissions, and task forces, by the formalized relationships between the president of the Faculty Senate and the speaker of the Student Assembly. The enactment of bills into university "laws" would require the customary agreement between the two houses, thus assuring among other things, the potency and meaningfulness of the Student Assembly and the involvement of the Faculty Senate in the full range of concerns animating the community.

²⁷ Charles C. Collins, "Student Rights and Due Process," Junior College Journal, April 1967, pp. 34-35.

²⁸ Edward Shoben Jr. Student and University Governance, U.S. Office of Education, Dept. of HEW, Pub. No. ED 031 138, November 1969.

For judicial functions, he says, there could be a number of ways.

One would be to involve tribunals comprising students, faculty members and administrative officers, appointed by the president with the advice and consent of a standing committee drawn from both the Faculty Senate and the Student Assembly. These courts would sit for the purpose of both hearing cases and reviewing legislation and administrative decisions with respect to their congruence to the basic laws and regulations of the community.

Which of these designs, or for that matter, any other model, should be adopted, is a question that needs much more deliberation and pensive thought by those who are concerned with the problem of student unrest on college campuses and its possible solution. It seems imperative that students voice can no longer remain unheard. In fact, the administrators can no more afford to remain indifferent to student demands which are genuine in the context of the situation.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study was to compare the views of administrators sampled with regard to the extent students should be involved in university governance with their views on the extent to which students participate in university governance under present institutional policies. More specifically, the objectives were:

1. To determine what the opinion of university officials is on the general scope of student involvement in university affairs and institutional governance.
2. To determine the official opinion on extent to which students are and should be involved in the areas of administration including institutions' general governance.
3. To determine official opinion on the extent of freedom students are given or should be given with regard to class attendance, academic and non-academic life on the campus.
4. To determine the degree of autonomy officials feel that the students have in the use of student-activity-funds

under the present institutional policies compared with the degree of autonomy the officials believe the students should have.

5. To ascertain if university/college officials responding to the questionnaire think that greater student involvement in total institutional governance would reduce tension on college and university campuses.

Sample

With the main object of ascertaining the attitudes and opinions of the administrators who are directly concerned with the students, officials from four year colleges and universities in the Intermountain Region were used as a sample.

The officers selected include 26 Academic Vice Presidents 9 Vice Presidents of Student Affairs, 27 Deans of Students, 9 Deans of Men, 16 Deans of Women, 8 Associate Deans of Students and other designates having the same functions, or a sample of 100 (see Table 1).

The Intermountain area from which these officers were chosen includes the following states: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These states were selected for reasons of similarity in the characteristics of the institutions in regard to geographical factors, socio-economic background of the students and for comparatively less disturbed campuses.

Table 1. Number of questionnaires sent out to and returned by respondents from institutions classified by state and position held

Institution by state	No. inst.	Position							Total sent	Total returned
		V. P. Acad.	V. P. St. Aff.	Dean Stud.	Dean Men	Dean Women	Ass. Dean Stud.	Other		
Arizona	3	3	0	2	1	0	2	0	8	5
Colorado	13	5	4	8	4	3	2	1	27	19
Idaho	4	3	1	3	2	2	0	1	12	11
Nevada	1						1	0	1	1
New Mexico	6	4	1	5	0	2	1	0	13	10
Montana	6	5		5	2	5	1	1	19	12
Utah	6	6	2	4	0	4	1	1	18	14
Wyoming	1		1					1	2	1
<hr/>										
TOTAL	34	26	9	27	9	16	8	5	100	73

Instrumentation

A questionnaire comparing the operational areas and functions of the various departments, namely (a) administration, (b) Curriculum and Instructional Program, (c) Extra Curricular Activities, and (d) Student Government, Student Control and Auxiliary Services was constructed measuring on a five point Likert Scale the opinions and the attitudes of the officers chosen for the study. The instrument was entitled "Student Involvement Study" (see Appendix A).

Part I of the instrument comprises statements designed to measure opinions of officers on student involvement in college governance.

Part II is designed to determine the existing institutional policies as against the officers' own points of view of what the administrative policies should be in regard to student participation in the various committees and councils in all the four areas, viz. (a) Administration, (b) Curriculum and Instruction, (c) Athletics and Extra Curricular, and (d) Student Government, Student Control and Auxiliary Services.

Part III is designed to determine the degree of freedom allowed under the present administrative policy of the institutions for different types of student activities on the campus or in the dormitories and the freedom that the responding officers would like to allow their students.

Part IV measures how much autonomy the present administration allows students in the use and control of student-activity fund and how much autonomy

the respondents think they would like to allow.

Finally in Part V one general question is asked with regard to the opinion of the responding officers whether a greater involvement of students in the different areas of institutional governance will help the problem of student demonstrations on the campuses become less acute.

Collection of Data

The instrument was mailed to the population with specific instructions in regard to its completion and the confidentiality of responses. No personal contact was made with any of these officers. Table 1 shows the exact breakdown by position and state.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Of the total one hundred officers to whom the questionnaire was sent, seventy three responded, representing a 73 percent return. Since nomenclature, type and number of committees were different in some areas and institutions, the distribution of responses does not tally in each and every part of the instrument.

The following table shows the distribution of the number of completed questionnaires returned by the officers category-wise.

Table 2. Number of questionnaires sent and the number received back from the responding officers

Officers (category-wise)	No. sent	No. returned	Percent
1. Academic Vice Presidents	26	15	58
2. Vice Presidents for Student Affairs	9	6	67
3. Deans of Students	27	26	96
4. Deans of Men	9	7	78
5. Deans of Women	16	11	69
6. Associate Deans of Students	8	6	75
7. Other	5	2	40
Totals	100	73	

Extent of Student Participation
in Campus Affairs

Responses received with regard to the five statements in Part I of the questionnaire which requires stating the type of activities students should engage in is shown in Table 3. There is almost unanimity in response that students should participate in a variety of activities that go on on the various campuses.

Table 3. Number of responses received in each of the five statements describing student participation

Statement	Responses
1. Student activities should generally be confined to their studies and class assignments.	0
2. In addition to 1 above, students should also participate in programs organized by official bodies of the institution, such as, departments and deans of students.	0
3. Besides 1 and 2, students should be allowed and encouraged to organize and participate in student government.	1
4. In addition to 1, 2, and 3, students should be free to take part in a variety of activities organized both on and off campus.	38
5. In addition to all the above, students should be involved as partners in the total college/university governance.	31

Extent of Student Participation Compared with Administrator Views
on What Student Participation Should be in Institutional Affairs

A. Student participation in administration:

In the area of administration the questionnaire compares the extent of student participation under the existing institutional policies and the extent of participation with additional privileges that the respondents would like these policies to allow.

The distribution of responses from the officers under each category of participation in various councils and committees is shown in the following Table 4.

From the information received from responding officers, the figures reveal that under the present policies of the various institutions the privileges of student participation, especially of right to vote, are very much restricted. This is particularly true in regard to important committees like the Board of Trustees/ Board of Higher Education and University/College Budget Committees. However, the officers show more liberal view for student participation and as such an opinion for more liberal policy.

1. Board of Trustees/ Board of Higher Education:

Of the seventy one officers responding to this question two (3 percent) said that their institutions were allowing students all privileges of participation and right to vote. Three said their schools allowed student membership on this body with the privilege of discussion, making a motion but no right to vote. Twenty-one institutions (30 percent) gave discussion privileges to student representatives.

Table 4. Student participation in the general administration of the institution as it exists now and what the officers think it should be

Boards and committees	University/College policy							Respondents' views						
	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motion but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motion but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
(i) Board of Trustees/Board of Higher Education	25	20	21	3	2	2	73	8	8	33	10	11	3	73
(ii) Administrative Council	32	6	10	5	12	8	73	9	6	18	6	27	7	73
(iii) Faculty Senate	30	10	10	2	14	7	73	10	12	15	5	26	5	73
(iv) Standing Committees:														
a. Admissions Committee	30	1	3	4	31	4	73	10	5	5	5	42	6	73
b. Curriculum Committee	11	3	9	2	43	5	73	2	2	6	9	50	4	73
c. Discipline Committee	3	0	1	2	65	2	73	1	1	2	1	65	3	73
d. Departmental Committee	18	7	8	3	23	14	73	3	4	13	5	40	8	73
e. Rules and Procedures Committee	7	2	6	2	36	20	73	0	1	9	3	46	14	73
(v) Program Coordinating Council	4	1	2	3	37	26	73	1	1	1	5	43	22	73
(vi) University/College Budget Committee	50	0	1	1	8	13	73	25	7	12	5	16	8	73

Twenty schools (29.6 percent) permitted students to sit as observers on these boards.

Compared with the above situation, the officers responding to the question "Your own view of what the policy should be" the following changes are indicated:

Of the seventy officials completing this question, eleven (16 percent) said that their view was to allow student representatives all privileges including right to vote. Ten (14 percent) indicated they would permit students to participate in discussions and making a motion but no voting privileges. Thirty three officers (47 percent) would allow their students discussion privileges only. The remaining eight officers (11 percent) of the seventy responding would not allow any student participation on these boards.

2. Administrative Council:

Sixty five officers gave their institutions' position. Twelve officer (about 20 percent) reported that their institutions allowed voting rights and other privileges to students on this council. Five (8 percent) said that their schools give student participants no voting rights but privileges of discussion and making a motion. Ten officers (15 percent) said that students in their institutions had discussion privileges on this administrative body. Six (9 percent) said that their institutions allowed students to sit as observers. Thirty two respondents mentioned that their institutions did not allow any student participation on this important body.

STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

As for the responding officers' views about student participation in this council the following is the statistical breakdown in the five categories. Of the total sixty six responding, twenty seven officials (41 percent) would like to allow students to participate with all privileges including right to vote. Six officers (9 percent) said that students should not be given a right to vote but participate in discussions and should be allowed to make a motion. Eighteen respondents (27 percent) would like students to participate in discussions only. The opinion of six officers (9 percent) was that students should be allowed to sit as observers while nine respondents (13.6 percent) would not allow any student participation in the deliberations of this council.

3. Faculty Senate:

Sixty six officers gave information about the present policies of their institutions with regard to student participation in the Faculty Senate. Fourteen of them (21 percent) indicated that students participate in Faculty Senate meetings with all privileges including voting rights. Two officers (3 percent) said that the students, in their institutions, were allowed to participate in the discussions and also could make a motion. Ten respondents reported that their colleges/universities allowed limited participation by the students to the extent of discussion privileges only. Ten (15 percent) said that students could sit as observers in the Faculty Senate meetings. The largest number, that is thirty officers (45.5 percent), said that their schools did not allow any student participation in the Senate deliberations.

The officers giving their own opinions about the categories of student participation in the above discussed Faculty Senate showed different choices which are evident in the following figures:

Of the sixty eight officers showing their opinion, twenty six (38 percent) said that the institutional policies should allow students all privileges of participation including voting rights. Five (7 percent) said that "discussion and making a motion" should be the privilege granted to students. Fifteen officers (22 percent) indicated that institutional policies should allow students at least discussion privileges. Twelve (17.6 percent) favored student involvement to the extent of mere observers, while ten officers were against student participation in Faculty Senate meetings.

5. Standing Committees:

In this area of administration five standing committees were included in this survey.

(a) Admissions Committee:

Under the present institutional policies of colleges/universities from where the officers were selected, the following information was received from the respondents.

Sixty nine officers sent the information. Thirty one (45 percent) said their institutions allowed students all privileges of participation in this committee along with the right to vote. Four officers (6 percent) said that their schools allowed discussion privileges and the right to make a motion. Three respondents (4 percent) reported that their institutions gave students

... ALI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

discussion privileges on this committee. One institution allowed students to sit as observers and thirty (43 percent) did not allow student participation at all.

Sixty six respondents gave their views concerning the extent to which students should be allowed to participate on the Administrative Committee. Of this number, forty two (62.7 percent) supported the view that the institutional policies should be to let students participate with all privileges and rights to vote. Five officers (7 percent) were in favor of allowing discussion privileges and also a right to make a motion. Five (7 percent) favored allowing students to participate in discussions and five others (7 percent) would let students sit on this committee as observers. Ten officers did not think they would allow any student participation on Admission Committee's work.

(b) Curriculum Committee:

This committee appears to be well represented by the students under the existing institutional policies. Sixty eight officers sent information about their schools and student participation. Forty three (63 percent) reported that their institutions granted students all privileges and right to vote as participants on this committee. Two officers (3 percent) said that their school allowed students discussion privileges and the right to make a motion. Down on the scale of participation nine officers (13 percent) indicated that student participation under the present policies was limited to discussion privileges only. Three respondents (4 percent) informed that their schools would let students sit on this committee as observers with no other privileges, and eleven officers said that the policies of their institutions did not allow any student participation on this committee.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

Officers presenting their own views as to what the policy on student participation on the Curriculum Committee should be gave the following preferences: Fifty administrators (72 percent) of the sixty nine responding said they would like to allow their students all the privileges of participation including the right to vote. Nine (13 percent) were of the opinion that students should have discussion privileges and the right to make a motion but should not be allowed to vote. Six officials (8.7 percent) would let the institutional policy allow discussion privileges while two said that students could be allowed to sit in the committee meetings as observers. Ten officers (14 percent) would allow no student participation on this committee.

(c) Discipline Committee:

With regard to student participation in the deliberations of this committee is concerned, the responding officers' view and opinions almost exactly went along with the extent of student participation existing under the present policies of these selected institutions. The responses showed that of the total of seventy officers who responded, sixty five (90 percent) would like to allow the students all privileges of participation and right to vote. The same number said that their schools allowed these privileges to the students under the existing policies. The remaining ten percent of the officers are similarly spread over the other four categories of student participation in this particular committee.

(d) Departmental Committee:

Existing policies seem to be somewhat strict with regard to departmental committee. Forty nine officers reported about the existing situation

under the present policies. Twenty three institutions (39 percent) allowed their students all privileges of participation and right to vote. Three officers (5 percent) said that in their institutions students could not vote on this committee but were allowed to participate in discussions and could also make a motion. Eight officers (13.5 percent) said that students had discussion privileges on this committee in their schools. Seven others (12 percent) said that students could only participate as observers under the present policies. Eighteen remaining officers (30 percent) reported that their schools did not allow student participation in this committee's work.

The responding officers presenting their own views indicated their choices of the extent of student participation as follows:

Forty (61.5 percent) of the sixty five officers indicated that they would allow all privileges and voting rights to student participants. Five (7.7 percent) said they would like the institutional policy to allow discussion privileges to students with a right to make a motion as well, but restrict voting rights. Thirteen respondents (20 percent) desired to give students only discussion privileges. Only four officers (6 percent) indicated that students should not be allowed any participation in this committee's work.

(e) Rules and Procedures Committee:

Not many schools seem to have this committee on their campus. Only fifty three officers completed the participation criteria as applied to their institutions. Thirty six officers (68 percent) said that their schools gave students all privileges of participation including the right to vote. Two officers (4 percent)

reported that their institutions allowed students to be on this committee for discussion purposes and the students could make a motion also. Six respondents (11 percent) said their institutional policy was to give students the privilege of discussion only. The institutions of two respondents (4 percent) would only let students sit on this committee as observers. The remaining seven officials (13 percent) said that their schools did not allow student representation on this committee.

Fifty nine officers gave their own views about what the policy should be in regard to this committee. Forty six administrators (78 percent) would like to see a policy which allowed students to participate with all privileges and voting rights. Three (5 percent) would like a policy which might not give students voting rights but allowed privileges of discussion and making a motion. Nine officers (15 percent) liked to see a policy which would at least grant discussion privileges to students. Only one officer (2 percent) said he would let students sit as observers on this committee. None of the officers would like to have a policy which barred students from participation.

5. Program Coordinating Council:

This council also seems to be rather uncommon on the campuses. Only forty seven returns were obtained from the sample. Thirty seven officers (79 percent) said that their institutional policies favored student participation on this council with all privileges and voting rights granted them. Three officers (6 percent) informed that under their present policies students participated in the functions of this council and enjoyed the privileges of discussion and making a

motion, but were not allowed to vote. Two respondents (4 percent) reported that students, under the existing regulations, participated in discussion only and had no other rights of participation. In his school, one officer said students could sit in this council as observers. The remaining four officers (8.5 percent) said that there was no provision for student participation in the policies of their institutions so far as this council is concerned.

Fifty one officers presented their own views and opinions of the kind of policies these institutions should have. Forty three officers (84 percent) said that institutional policies should allow students to participate with all privileges and voting rights. Five officials (9 percent) desired that if the school policies did not provide students with voting rights they should grant them privileges of discussion and making a motion. One official said that he would let students sit in the meetings of this council as observers. Only one official was against a policy that would involve students in this council.

6. University/College Budget Committee:

Although this is one of the most important committees in all administrations only sixty officials sent information about their present policies concerning student participation. Eight officials (13 percent) said that under their institutional policies students were represented on this committee and were allowed all privileges of participation including voting rights. One officer (1.7 percent) said that in his school students discussed and made motion in the Budget Committee but were not permitted to vote. Another administrator said that his

college gave students discussion privileges only. Fifty officials (83 percent) reported that their schools did not allow any student participation in this committee.

Sixty five administrators presented their opinions as to what the policies should be regarding student participation in the Budget Committee. Sixteen of them (25 percent) said that they would like to have a policy whereby students had all the privileges of participation and voting rights. Five officers (7.6 percent) were of the opinion that institutional policies should allow students the privileges of discussion, and making motion, but no vote. Twelve officials (18 percent) thought that only discussion privileges should be allowed to students. The opinion of seven officers (10.7 percent) was to limit student participation to observers only. Twenty five administrators would not have a policy which allowed students any participation in the Budget Committee.

B. Curriculum and Instruction:

Continuing the comparison between the existing institutional policies and what the respondents feel the policy should be regarding student participation in committees on Curriculum and Instruction the following Table 5 presents the categorical distribution of responses on the five point scale.

In this section of the study, as one looks at the range of the two extremes, a definite difference is again evident in terms of increased desire on the part of the respondents for allowing greater student participation in these committees.

Table 5. Extent of student participation in committees on curriculum and instruction under existing institutional policy and the respondents' views in regard to participation

Committees	University/College Policy							Respondents' Views						
	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motion but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motion but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
(i) Planning Committees on:														
(a) Curriculum	13	6	9	3	39	3	73	1	3	12	8	48	1	73
(b) Academic calendar	26	4	4	1	37	1	73	4	4	9	2	53	1	73
(c) Degree requirements	29	7	10	3	15	9	73	5	5	20	8	29	6	73
(ii) Teacher evaluation	9	5	11	4	34	10	73	2	1	12	4	47	7	73
(iii) Student evaluation	23	2	7	2	14	25	73	14	3	8	5	28	15	73

1. Committee on Curriculum:

Seventy officers reported about their institutions' policies regarding student participation in the area of curriculum and instruction. Thirty nine of these officers (56 percent) said that their schools allowed students all privileges and right to vote to participate in the work of this committee. Three officers (4 percent) reported that their institutions allowed discussion privileges and permitted students to make motion but no right to vote. Nine schools (13 percent) had a policy of letting students participate in the discussions that went on in this committee. Six respondents (8.6 percent) said that the policy in their school was to allow students to sit as observers during the deliberations of this committee. The remaining thirteen officials (19 percent) said that under their existing administrative policies students were not allowed to participate in the committee on curriculum.

Seventy two officials gave their views about what the policy should be on student participation on the Curriculum Committee. Of this number, forty eight (67 percent) indicated that they would like the policies to be liberal to grant all privileges and voting rights for greater student participation. Eight officers (11 percent) liked the policies that would allow the students privileges of discussion, making motion but no vote. Twelve others (17 percent) wanted to have a policy under which students could participate in discussions that went on in this committee. Three respondents (4 percent) were willing only for allowing students as observers at the meetings. The remaining one officer was against student participation.

2. Committee on Academic Calendar:

Seventy two officers returned information about the policies in their institutions. Thirty seven of these officers (51 percent) said that their schools already had students represented on this committee with all the privileges and voting rights. One officer said that his institution did not allow its students any voting rights but students participated in discussions and were allowed to make motions. Four respondents (5.5 percent) said that their schools allowed discussion privileges to students, and four more said that the policy in their institution was to let students sit in the meetings as observers. Twenty six officials (36 percent) reported that the policies in their schools did not allow student representation on the Committee on Academic Calendar.

From amongst the seventy two officers giving their own views on "What the policy should be," on student participation on the Academic Calendar Committee, fifty three (73 percent) said that institutional policy should allow students to participate with all privileges including right to vote. Two officers (3 percent) said they would allow discussion and motion making privileges but no right to vote. Nine administrators (12 percent) would give the students discussion privileges only. Four others (5.5 percent) would allow their students to sit as observers on this committee. The remaining four officers said that they would not have a policy of allowing student participation.

3. Committee on Degree Requirements:

Sixty four administrators reported their existing policies concerning student participation on degree requirements. Fifteen (23 percent) said that their

schools allowed students all the privileges of participation and right to vote.

Three officials (5 percent) said that the policy in their institution was restricted to allowing the students discussion and the privilege of motion making only when they participated in this committee's work. They were not allowed to vote.

Ten administrators (15.6 percent) said that their school policies limited student participation to the extent of discussion privileges only. Seven others (11 percent) reported that under existing regulations students could sit as observers in the meetings of this committee. Twenty nine officers (45 percent) said that their institutions did not allow any student participation in this committee.

Sixty seven responding officers presented their own views as to what the policy should be on student participation on the degree requirement committee. Twenty nine of these officers (43 percent) said that they would like to have a policy that would allow students all privileges of committee membership including right to vote. Eight officials (12 percent) were of the view that barring voting rights, students must be allowed discussion privileges and permission to make a motion. Twenty respondents (30 percent) would let the students participate in the discussions while four (6 percent) would let students sit as observers. Five officials said they would not allow any student participation so far as this committee was concerned.

4. Committee on Teacher Evaluation:

Under the existing policies of their institutions, thirty four (54 percent) of the sixty three officers responding, said that their institutions allowed student participation to the extent of giving them all privileges and right to vote. Four

officers (6 percent) referred to their institutional policies as not allowing voting rights but the privileges of participation in discussions and also of making a motion. Eleven administrators (17 percent) mentioned that their policies were limited to discussion privileges only. Seven officers (11 percent) had policies in their schools which would only let students sit as observers. Twenty nine officials said that their institutions did not permit student participation in teacher evaluation.

Of the sixty six officers who presented their own views with regard to the kind of policy they would like to have on student participation in teacher evaluation, forty seven (71 percent) said that they liked the students to have all the privileges of participation and right to vote. Four officials (6 percent) would like to see that students were involved in the discussions, were allowed to make a motion but may also vote. Twelve respondents (17 percent) said that their policy would be to allow discussion privileges to students. One officer (1.5 percent) said that institutional policies should not allow any student participation.

5. Committee on Student Evaluation:

It seems not many campuses have this committee set up. Only forty eight administrators reported about the policies in their schools with regard to this committee. Fourteen of them (30 percent) said that their institutions allowed students all privileges of participating in the deliberations of this committee including voting rights. Two officers (4 percent) said that barring voting privileges, their policies allowed students to be involved in discussions as well as in making motions. Seven others (14.6 percent) referred to their

policies as limited to discussion privileges only. Two officials (4 percent) said that their schools allowed the students to sit as observers on this committee. The remaining twenty three officers (48 percent) reported that their institutional policies did not allow any student participation.

Forty eight administrators gave their own opinions about the kind of policy they would like to have on student evaluation. Twenty eight of these officers (48 percent) would like to have a policy which would allow students all privileges of participation and voting rights. Five officials (8.6 percent) preferred to have a policy which would not allow voting rights but other privileges of participation, like involvement in discussion and the right to make a motion. Eight respondents (14 percent) were of the opinion that students should be allowed discussion privileges only. Three others (5 percent) thought that a policy to let the students sit on this committee as observers would be acceptable to them. Fourteen remaining officers (24 percent) supported the view that institutional policy should not allow student participation in this committee.

An overview of all these committees where student participation is estimated under existing policies with regard to the responding officers' views, one can see rather vividly, that the officers selected as a sample for this study, are more inclined toward increasing student involvement for meaningful participation. In other words a large number of these officers are of the opinion that full privileges and voting rights be extended to the students to make such participation meaningful.

C. Athletics and Extra-Curricular

In this section there already seems to be substantial extension of privileges provided by the institutions for more student participation in the committees listed. Still when figures on participation are compared with opinions of the responding officers, their views indicate that they would allow broader participation.

Table 6 on the following page shows the comparative statistics between the number of institutions giving this privilege at present and respondents' views on the same five point scale.

1. Interscholastic Athletics and Sports Council:

Sixty six administrative officers returned information about the existing administrative policies in their institutions with regard to student participation on the Athletic Council. Fifty one officers (77 percent) said that under the present policies of their institutions students participated with all privileges and had a right to vote. Four officers (6 percent) said their institutions allowed students to participate in discussions and could make a motion but had no voting rights. One administrator (1.5 percent) reported that discussion privileges were allowed under his institution's policy. Another one said that his college permitted students to sit as observers in the meetings of this council. The rest of the nine officers (13.6 percent) said that students had no participation privileges under their present institutional policies.

Presenting their own views about student participation on the Athletics Council, the sixty six officers were divided among only three categories, viz.

Table 6. Extent of present participation in committees on athletics and extra curricular activities and what the respondents would like it to be

Committees	Present participation							Respondents' views						
	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motion, but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making a motion, but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
(i) Interscholastic athletics and sports council	9	1	1	4	51	7	73	0	0	3	2	61	7	73
(ii) Musical and theatrical committee	2	1	4	1	51	14	73	0	0	3	3	57	10	73
(iii) Committee on intramurals	1	1	1	2	55	13	73	0	0	1	0	61	11	73
(iv) Committee on tours	4	2	3	0	25	39	73	2	0	2	3	31	35	73

Discussion Privileges, Discussion, Making Motion but No Vote, and All Privileges and right to vote. Sixty one of these officers (92 percent) said that they would extend to the students all privileges of participation and voting rights. Two officers (3 percent) said they would give students the privilege of discussion and making a motion but no right to vote. Three officers (4.5 percent) would allow discussion privileges only.

2. Musical and Theatrical Committee:

A total of fifty nine responses were received about the present policies of the selected colleges and universities. Of these fifty nine officers, fifty one (86 percent) said that their institutions allowed all the privileges to students along with voting rights to participate in this committee. One officer (1.7 percent) said that his school did not allow a vote to the student participants but gave them privileges of discussion and making a motion. Four respondents (6.7 percent) reported that they allowed their students discussion privileges only under the present institutional policy. His school, according to this lone officer, would only allow students to sit as observers without any active participation. Two officers (3 percent) said that there was no provision for student participation under their policies.

In their own views again the sixty three officers were distributed among the same three categories as in the Interscholastic Athletics and Sports Council. Fifty seven of these officers (90 percent) would extend all privileges and voting rights to students when participating in this committee. Three officers (4.7 percent) would allow discussion privileges, right to make a motion but no vote.

The remaining three administrators (4.7 percent) would give students discussion privileges only.

3. Committee on Intramurals:

Sixty officials responded in checking different categories of student participation under their present institutional policies. Fifty five officers (91.6 percent) said that their schools allowed all privileges and right to vote to students for participation in this committee's work. Two officers (3 percent) said that their institutions did not allow students to vote but gave them discussion privileges and permitted them to make motion. In each of the remaining three categories of participation, viz. "Discussion Privileges," "An an Observer," and "No Participation," only one response (1.6 percent) was received.

Sixty two respondents presented their own views on student participation on the Intramurals Committee. Sixty one officers (98 percent) said that they would give their students all privileges and voting rights for participation in this committee. The remaining one officer (2 percent) said that he would allow students discussion privilege only.

4. Committee on Tours:

This seems to be a rather uncommon committee on the campuses. Only thirty four officers responded so far as existing institutional policies were concerned. Of the thirty four respondents, twenty five (74 percent) said that their institutions allowed all privileges and voting rights to the students on this committee. Three officers (9 percent) said that their students had discussion privileges on this committee. Two administrators (6 percent) replied that they

allowed students to observe the proceedings of this committee and the remaining four officers (12 percent) said that their institutional policies did not allow any student participation.

Thirty eight officers gave their view about what extent of participation students should be given on the Tours Committee. Thirty one respondents (81.6 percent) would like to extend to the students all privileges of participation including right to vote. Three officials (8 percent) would not give students a right to vote but would allow them the privileges of discussion and making a motion. Two officers (5 percent) would grant them discussion privileges and the remaining two officers (5 percent) said that they would not allow any student participation.

D. Student Government, Student Control, and Auxiliary Services

Students seem to have a more significant role in almost all the committees and councils in these categories, within these institutions at the present time. Still the responding officers feel that on some of the committees, student participation should be extended. The comparative figures are presented in Table 7 on the following page.

1-4. Student Union Finance Body, Student Press and Publication Council, and Student Organizations:

Among the eight committees included in this section the first four are primarily student organized committees and as such both under the existing policies of the institutions and the views of the officers there is almost one hundred percent

Table 7. Institutional policies and views of administrative officers on student government, student control and auxiliary services

Organizations	Institutional policy							Officers' views						
	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motions but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total	No participation	As an observer	Discussion privileges	Discussion, making motion, but no vote	All privileges and right to vote	No response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
(i) Student Union Finance Body	2	0	1	1	61	8	73	0	0	2	0	63	8	73
(ii) Student Press and Publication Council	0	0	0	3	67	3	73	0	0	0	5	65	3	73
(iii) Student Council	0	0	0	0	70	3	73	0	0	0	0	70	3	73
(iv) Student Organizations, such as S. D. S., Black Students Union, Fraternities and Sororities	1	0	1	1	60	10	73	1	0	1	1	65	5	73
(v) Student Housing Committee	4	0	4	1	44	20	73	0	0	1	1	65	5	73
(vi) Dormitory Rules Committee	4	0	5	2	58	4	73	1	0	3	3	61	5	73
(vii) Committee on Cafeteria and Meals	4	0	6	4	43	16	73	1	0	4	4	51	13	73
(viii) Campus Security Body	22	4	6	2	21	18	73	3	2	12	2	37	17	73

agreement on the granting of all privileges and voting rights to students. Except for two officers reporting "No Participation" in Student Union Finance Committee deliberations all others were in favor of full student participation.

5. Student Housing Committee:

Fifty three officers returned information about the policies of their institutions on the Student Housing Committee. Forty four officers (83 percent) said that their institutional policies allowed students all the privileges of participation and right to vote in regard to this committee. One officer (2 percent) said that his school allowed discussion privileges and permitted students to make a motion but denied voting rights. Four officers (7.5 percent) informed that under their school policies students could participate in discussions only. The remaining four officials reported that their institutions did not allow any student participation in this committee.

Fifty six officers gave their own views about student participation in Housing Committee. Fifty officials (90 percent) would give the students all privileges and right to vote. Three (5 percent) said that they would not give voting rights but would extend the privileges of discussion and would also let students make a motion. The rest of the three (5 percent) would give students only discussions privileges.

6. Dormitory Rules Committee:

Existing policies indicated greater student voice in the Dormitory Rules Committee. Out of a total of sixty nine officers responding, fifty eight (84 percent) said that their institutions were allowing students all privileges of participation including right to vote. Two officers (3 percent) said that their schools

allowed discussion privileges and right to make a motion but did not allow students to vote. Five administrators reported that under their present policies students participated in discussions only. Four (6 percent) reported that their institutions did not allow any student participation in this committee.

Sixty eight officials presented their own views as compared to the above policies. Sixty one (90 percent) said that they would extend to students all the privileges of participation and would give them a right to vote. Three officers (4 percent) said they would allow students to participate in discussions and making a motion but would restrict voting privileges. Three (4 percent) said that they would only allow discussion rights, while one officer (2 percent) said that he would not allow any student participation.

7. Committee on Cafeteria and Meals:

Information about the present policies of the institutions was received from fifty seven officers. Forty three of them (75 percent) said that their schools were allowing students full participation with all the privileges and right to vote in the Cafeteria Committee. Four (7 percent) said that their institutions allowed students discussion privileges and did let them make a motion. Six officials (10.5 percent) reported that students had discussion privileges only under the existing policy. Four officers (7 percent) said that their policies did not permit student participation.

Sixty officials gave their own opinions about student participation as members of the Cafeteria Committee. Fifty one (80 percent) said that they would give students all the privileges of participation including voting rights.

Four officers (6.6 percent) said that they would be willing to let students participate in discussions and make a motion. Four more (6.6 percent) said they would allow only discussion privileges. Only one officer (1.6 percent) said that he would not allow any student participation in this committee.

8. Campus Security Body:

There is a wide dispersion of the types of participation seen under the existing policies. The number of those institutions that disallow student involvement is larger than those which give students participation privileges. Fifty five officers sent the information about the practice in their schools. Twenty one (38 percent) said that their school allowed greater student involvement by giving them all privileges of participation and right to vote. Two administrators (4 percent) said that their institutional policies limited voting rights but permitted students to take part in discussions and the students could also make a motion. Six institutions according to six other officers (11 percent) allowed only limited participation to the extent of discussion privileges only. Four officers (7 percent) replied that their institutions would let the students sit in this body as observers. Twenty two (40 percent) said that their institutional policies did not allow any student participation on this body.

Fifty six officers gave their views about student involvement in this Campus Security Body. Thirty seven (66 percent) said that they would allow students all privileges and voting rights to be the members of this body. Two officials (3.6 percent) said that they would let the students participate in discussions and would allow them to make a motion. Twelve administrators (21.6 percent) would

only allow discussion privileges. Two officers (3.6 percent) said that they would let students sit in the meetings of this body as observers. The remaining three officers (5.2 percent) said that they would not allow any student participation on this body.

Comparison between range of freedom
in selected activities allowed by the
institutions and the range of freedom
that the officials think they would allow
students *

These activities were selected primarily from the consideration that students have a greater responsibility in making decisions about them. Some of these activities are purely student organized. In Table 8 the respondents' views are seen as compared with the freedom of participation that exists under the present institutional policies.

*The measurement of "Range of Freedom" in this section and the "Degree of Autonomy" in the following section has been considered in terms of percentage distribution as follows:

Complete Freedom/Complete Autonomy	- 100 percent
Considerable Freedom/Considerable Autonomy	= 75 percent
Some Freedom/Some Autonomy	= 50 percent
A Little Freedom/A Little Autonomy	= 25 percent

Table 8. Range of freedom allowed under existing institutional policy and the responding officers' views as to how much range should be allowed

Areas of activity	Freedom presently allowed							Freedom respondents will allow						
	No freedom	A little freedom	Some freedom	Considerable freedom	Complete freedom	No response	Total	No freedom	A little freedom	Some freedom	Considerable freedom	Complete freedom	No response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
(i) Class attendance	2	6	22	27	15	1	73	1	4	16	22	30	0	73
(ii) Planning a field of study	2	6	25	26	8	6	73	1	0	19	34	13	0	73
(iii) Selection of criteria of evaluation of student performance	25	14	20	5	1	8	73	6	4	34	18	5	6	73
(iv) Student newspaper	0	0	3	37	30	3	73	0	0	5	36	29	3	73
(v) Student Union programs	0	0	6	31	31	5	73	0	0	2	32	34	5	73
(vi) Student dress	0	1	3	23	44	2	73	0	1	3	25	42	2	73
(vii) Dormitory hours	0	3	10	43	14	3	73	0	0	6	34	30	3	73
(viii) Eligibility to run for student body office	0	1	8	37	22	5	73	0	0	7	39	23	4	73
(ix) R. O. T. C. and physical education program	7	7	16	14	11	18	73	1	1	11	23	20	17	73
(x) Fraternity and sorority activities	0	0	1	26	27	19	73	0	0	1	23	30	19	73
(xi) Inviting outside speakers on campus	0	5	5	32	27	4	73	0	3	5	33	29	3	73
(xii) Peaceful protest against national, state and local political and social issues	1	2	8	21	37	4	73	0	2	6	24	38	3	73
(xiii) Peaceful protest against institutional policies	1	1	9	23	35	4	73	0	2	6	24	38	3	73

A notable feature in this comparison is the closeness of the responses in categories (4) Considerable Freedom, and (5) Complete Freedom, which is noticeable throughout the entire list of items included in Table 8. However, there are a few differences that need to be discussed, concerning some of the items.

1. Class Attendance:

Out of the total of seventy two officials telling about their institutional policies only fifteen (20.8 percent) said that their schools gave students complete freedom in class attendance, while out of the seventy three officials presenting their own views thirty (41 percent) said that they were willing to give students complete freedom so far as class attendance was concerned. In the other categories on the scale there is not any significant difference as such.

3. Selection of Criteria of Evaluation of Student Performance:

In the case of this activity the significant difference is seen at the other end of the scale. Of the total of sixty five respondents giving information about their institutional policies twenty five (38.4 percent) said that within the policy structure of their institutions students were given no freedom in the selection of the criteria for evaluating their performance. As against this, of the total sixty seven officers presenting their views, only six (9 percent) said that they would not give any freedom to students in this regard. Also notice in the category "Considerable Freedom" only five officers (7.7 percent) said that their institutions were giving considerable freedom to students. As compared with this eighteen officers (27 percent) of the total of sixty seven, giving their views,

said that they would give considerable freedom to students to select the criteria of the evaluation of their work.

7. Dormitory Hours:

Another significant difference is noticeable here. Fourteen officers (20 percent) of the total of seventy who gave information about their institutions' policies said that students were allowed complete freedom. The responding officers, in regard to their own views, were twice as many in number who were willing to allow complete freedom, that is thirty (43 percent) out of seventy said that they would allow complete freedom to students in the observance of dormitory hours.

9. R. O. T. C. and Physical Education Program:

From the sample a good number of schools did not seem to have this program. Fifty five officials gave information about the existing policies of their institutions. Eleven administrators (20 percent) said that their schools gave complete freedom to the students in the area of this activity. As against this, twenty of the fifty six officers (36 percent) said that they would be willing to extend complete freedom to students.

The policy of fourteen schools as reported by their fourteen officers (25 percent) was to allow considerable freedom to their students in R. O. T. C. and Physical Education Program. Compared to this twenty three (41 percent) of the fifty six responding officers declared that they would give complete freedom to students in this area of student activity.

As already mentioned in the beginning of this section the representative figures in the different categories of freedom concerning the remaining activities on the list are so closely distributed that the differences are not very distinctive.

Degree of autonomy institutions allow
compared to the degree of autonomy
officials are willing to allow students
in allocating funds for selected activities

In this part of the questionnaire the degree of autonomy in the use of student activity fund by the students under the present institutional policies is compared with the officers' view as to how much autonomy they would like to give to their students. The officers' views are seen in close agreement with the present policies of the institutions. Table 9 shows the distribution of responses.

1. Allocation of Funds for Student Press and Publication:

Under the present policies of their institutions twenty seven officials (38.7 percent) out of a total of seventy said that students were allowed complete autonomy in the use of these funds. Thirty one officers (44 percent) said that their schools gave considerable autonomy to their students. Nine respondents (13 percent) reported that their policies in this regard were to give some autonomy while one officer said that his institution only gave a little or very limited autonomy to students to use these funds. There were two institutions in which the

Table 9. Degree of autonomy for use of funds under existing policy and the responding officers' views

Student activity fund	Present autonomy							Respondents' views						
	No autonomy	A little autonomy	Some autonomy	Considerable autonomy	Complete autonomy	No response	Total	No autonomy	A little autonomy	Some autonomy	Considerable autonomy	Complete autonomy	No response	Total
	1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
(i) Allocation of funds for student press and publication	2	1	9	31	27	3	73	1	0	5	34	29	4	73
(ii) Allocation of funds for intramural activities	4	1	8	33	19	8	73	3	1	6	30	26	7	73
(iii) Allocation of funds for educational and other tours	4	2	9	21	19	18	73	1	2	9	22	23	16	73
(iv) Funds for inviting outside groups and individuals on campus	1	0	9	29	28	6	73	1	0	6	30	30	6	73
(v) Funds for running student government	1	1	2	27	39	3	73	1	0	2	25	41	4	73

the two officers (3 percent) said that they did not allow any autonomy to their students concerning this fund.

Sixty nine respondents gave their opinions as to how much autonomy they were willing to give to the students. Twenty nine officers (42 percent) said that they would give their students complete autonomy in the use of funds for press and publication. Thirty four (almost 50 percent) said that they would be willing to give considerable autonomy to their students. Five (7 percent) officials said they would give some autonomy and only one (1.4 percent) said that he would not give any autonomy to his students in the use of these funds.

2. Allocation of Funds for Intramural Activities:

Sixty four officers reported about the policies followed in their institutions regarding use of these funds by the students. Nineteen of them (29 percent) said that their schools were giving complete autonomy to the students in the use of these funds. Thirty three (50.7 percent) said that their institutions allowed considerable autonomy. Eight (12 percent) said that their institutional policy only gave a little autonomy. Four officers reported that under their institutional policy students are given no autonomy at all.

Of the total of sixty six officers giving their views in regard to the extent of autonomy that students should have in the use of these funds twenty six (40 percent) said that they would allow complete autonomy to their students. Thirty officials (45.4 percent) would give considerable autonomy and six (9 percent) said that they would give some autonomy. One officer (1.5 percent) said he would only give a little autonomy. There were three officers (4.5 percent) who said that

they would give no autonomy to students in the use of these funds.

3. Allocation of Funds for Educational and Other Tours:

Only fifty five officers gave information about the policies in their schools about this fund. It seems that some schools do not have a separate allocation of funds for this purpose. However, nineteen officers (34.5 percent) said that their schools allowed complete autonomy to the students to use these funds the way they wanted to use them. Twenty one officers (38 percent) said that under their institutional policies students were allowed considerable autonomy. Nine (16 percent) said that some autonomy was given to the students to utilize these funds in their own ways. Two officials (3.6 percent) reported that their schools gave a little autonomy, while four officers (7 percent) said their schools would not give autonomy to their students in the use of this fund.

Fifty seven administrators gave their own views as to that degree of autonomy they would allow students in the use and allocation of these funds for tours. Twenty three officials (40 percent) said that they would give complete autonomy to students to use this fund. Twenty two respondents (38.6 percent) said that they would give considerable autonomy. Nine (15.8 percent) said that they would give some degree of autonomy. Two officers (3.5 percent) were of the opinion that they would allow only a little autonomy. One was against giving any autonomy to students in the use of this fund.

4. Funds for Inviting Outside Groups and Individuals on Campus:

Sixty seven officials returned information about the degree of autonomy that their institutions gave to students in using funds to invite outsiders on the

campus. Twenty eight officials (42 percent) said that their institutions gave complete autonomy to students for the use of funds for outside speakers who would be invited on the campus. Twenty nine respondents (43 percent) reported that their school policies allowed considerable autonomy to students in this activity. Nine officials (13 percent) said their school gave some degree of autonomy and one officer said that his school did not give any autonomy whatsoever to students in the use of funds for this purpose.

The sixty seven officers presenting their views about the degree of autonomy they would allow the students, agreed with the existing policies almost in the same ratio in each of the five categories of autonomy.

5. Funds for Running Student Government:

In the use of funds for student government the officers views of the degree of autonomy that they would like to give is almost the same in each of the five categories on the scale as already existed under the present policies of the institutions.

Effect of Student Involvement in Institutional Governance
on Student Protest and Demonstration

The discussion in this section deals with the answer to this question:

"Do you feel that a greater involvement of students in different areas of institutional governance will ease the problem of student demonstrations on the campuses?" The responses were as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Not at all	4	05
2. A little	4	05
3. To some extent	34	47
4. Considerably	26	36
5. Completely	0	00
No response	5	07
	—	—
Total	73	100

Of course no one could say that student involvement would be the panacea to the problem of student demonstration, but it is interesting to see that twenty six officers (36 percent) felt that student involvement would considerably reduce the problem. Thirty four (47 percent) felt that the problem would ease to some extent. Only four officers felt that student involvement in institutional governance will do nothing so far as the problem of student unrest and campus demonstrations were concerned.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Review of literature

The problem of student demonstrations and unrest was serious in American colleges and universities in 1969-70, and people in all walks of life became concerned about the situation which developed as a result of this type of student behavior. Student-administration relationship, administrative indifference to student voice, communications gap and limited student involvement in the affairs of the institutions of higher education are some of the causes of the unrest reviewed in the literature included in this study.

It has been felt that there is greater need for student participation in campus affairs. Because of the affluence in American society, increased enrollment of students in colleges and universities and the changing patterns of institutional policies students find themselves a neglected lot.

Students feel that they have a right to be part of every institutional set up related to them and their lives. This has been supported by educationists and writers referred to in the review. The joint Statement on Academic Freedom of students and the Statement on Student Rights are some of the examples.

Universities and colleges have started doing something in connection with this situation. References have been included from fourteen different institutions showing how students were getting involved in the institutional affairs.

Certain proposals for institutional governance have been reviewed. The Joint Student Faculty Committee at the University of California in Berkeley is one example and the Edward J. Shoben Jr. Plan from the State University of New York is the other.

General summary

The administration in colleges and universities, and in the country as a whole, had to face this problem of student reaction to lack of involvement with an unexpected urgency. Since administration in institutions of higher education was and is directly related to this problem, this study looks into the extent of student participation in university administration under existing university policy in 1971 compared with the extent to which students should be allowed to participate in such governance in the opinion of the administrators sampled. The data were collected by use of a questionnaire designed specifically for the study.

The main objectives of the study were:

1. To determine what the opinion of the university officials is on the general scope of student involvement in university affairs and institutional governance.
2. To determine the extent to which students are and should be involved in areas of administration including general governance, as viewed by the officers included in this study.
3. To compare the latitude of freedom that students should have in the opinion of the selected officers regarding class attendance, and academic and nonacademic life of the pupils with the extent of freedom that students are allowed under the existing institutional policies.
4. To determine the degree of autonomy that students should have in the opinion of the officers in the sample, regarding use of student activity fund as against the degree of autonomy that is given to students under the present school policies.
5. To ascertain if university officials responding to the questionnaire think that greater student involvement in the total institutional governance would reduce tension on college and university campuses.

The administrative officers in this study were selected from four year colleges and universities in the states of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. They were asked about their views

of the present institutional policies of their respective schools and whether they agreed with these policies. They were also asked to indicate their views in regard to various aspects of freedom and autonomy given to students under the existing policies with regard to student participation in the governance of campus activities, both curricular and extra curricular.

Findings and Conclusions

There is a general agreement among the responding officers that students must be allowed to get more involved in a variety of curricular and extra curricular activities both on the campus and off the campus.

The study found that in some administratively organized important councils and committees, particularly administrative boards (Board of Trustees/ Board of Higher Education) and Budget Committees students are not allowed to participate in any recognizable degree. Most school officials in this sample group were willing to give the students more voice in these areas of school administration than the institutions presently allow.

The freedom that students have under the present policy rules of these selected institutions with regard to the criteria developed for student performance, planning a field of study and class attendance etc, is both restrictive as well as limited in many institutions included in this study. The views of the responding officers obtained through the questionnaire revealed that they were willing to give students more voice in these areas of governance.

In an attempt to find out the degree of autonomy that students have and should have in the use of student activity fund, it was found that considerable autonomy is provided under the present institutional policies, so that students could use the allocated appropriation with great freedom. There was general agreement on the part of the administrative officers with the existing policies and practices.

So far as the reduction of tension around the campus was concerned officials believed that greater overall student involvement in college/university governance would reduce it to some extent, but in no case would this solve the problem of student protest and demonstrations on campus totally.

It can be concluded that the responding officers favor some liberalization of the present institutional policies and allow greater administrative, academic and nonacademic intercourse between students and administrators.

Recommendations

The study has been very limited in terms of the number of institutions, officers, and the area of coverage included in it. Therefore, recommendations both specific and general, will be limited in content and extent.

1. The institutions of higher education in the areas covered should begin to think in terms of allowing greater student representation on important committees and councils like the Board of Trustees/Board of Higher Education and Budget Committees,

etc. and of giving more privileges and rights to students for participation in different areas of administration.

2. That similar surveys may be attempted in other areas of the country and views and opinions of other administrative officers obtained so that a better overall picture of the relationship between the existing institutional policies and the views of the administrators could be developed nationwide. This may help in setting up certain common policies to the advantage of all parties concerned and may result in avoiding some problems that we tend to relate to student governance

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anders, Don F. 1969. Proposed Junior College Administrative Action and Reaction to Student Activists. Office of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C.
- Barnet, Vincent M. Jr. 1969. Confrontation, Catalyst for Consensus. Association of College and University Housing Officers, Boston, Mass.
- Bay, C. 1967. Political and Apolitical Students. Journal of Social Issues.
- Carr, Alden J. 1959. Student Participation in College Policy Making. The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.
- Chapman, James L. 1968. "The Board of Trustees and Student Behavior," School and Society, Vol. 96. October.
- Collins, Charles C. 1967. "Student Rights and Due Process," Junior College Journal. April.
- Draper, Hall. 1965. Berkeley, The New Student Revolt. Grove Press, New York.
- Eddy, Edward D. Jr. 1966. Some Suggestions for Student Involvement in Educational Policy. American Council on Education.
- Evans, Medford S. 1961. Revolt on Campus. H. Regnery Co., Chicago.
- Falvey, Frances E. 1952. Student Participation in College Administration. Bureau of Publications, Teachers, College, New York.
- Feuer, Lewis S. 1969. The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements. Basic Books, New York.
- Haehnlen, Fredrick. 1968. "Student Unrest - The 'P' Factor Theory," Phi-Delta Kappan, University of Hawaii Chapter, College of Education, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- Hein, Eileen. 1968. "A Case for Student Involvement," Junior College Journal 38:44. February.

- Hodgkinson, Harold. 1969. Student Participation in Campus Governance. Center for Research and Development, Berkeley, California.
- Hunt, Everett L. 1963. The Revolt of the College Intellectual. Human Relations Aid, New York.
- Jacobs, J. 1968. "Between Reform and Revolution," Nation. pp. 206, 753-757. June.
- Johnston, Q.W. 1968. "Amnesty vs. Order on College Campuses," School and Society. October.
- Joughin, Louis. 1968. The Role of the Student in College and University Government. American Association of University Professors. May.
- Knorr, Owen A. and W. John Minter. 1965. Order and Freedom on the Campus: The Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty and Students. Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder.
- Lipset, Seymour M. 1967. Student Politics. Basic Books, Inc., London New York.
- Lipset, Seymour M. and Sheldo S. Wolin. 1965. The Berkeley Student Revolt. Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., New York.
- Lunn, Harry H. Jr. 1957. The Student's Role in College Policy Making. American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.
- Mallery, David. 1965-66. Ferment on the Campus: An Encounter with the New College Generation (1st Ed.), Harper and Row, New York.
- Matson, Jane E. 1967. "Statements on Student Rights," Junior College Journal. Vol. 38. November.
- Mayhew, Lewis. 1968. "Quotes on Dissent," The Phi Delta Kappan 40(1). Sept.
- Mock, Kathlene B. 1968. The Potential Activist and His Perception of The University. American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C. August.
- Ostar, Allan W. and Jane Otten. 1968. "Innovations: Fresh Developments at State Higher Education Institutions," School and Society. January.

- Pasqua, Thomas M. Jr. 1968. 'Student Publication Policies,' Junior College Journal, Vol. 38. March.
- Remmers, Hermann H. 1963. Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools. Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Ill.
- Sasajima, Masu, Davis & R. E. Peterson. 1968. Organized Student Protest and Institutional Climate. American Education Research Journal.
- Schwab, Joseph Jackson. 1969. College Curriculum and Student Protest. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Shaefer, Robert J. 1969. Campus Unrest and Exhausted Administrator. Columbia University Teachers College, New York.
- Shoben, Edward J. Jr. 1969. Student and University Governance. State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Smith, G. Kerry. 1968. "Stress and Campus Response," Current Issues in Higher Education, San Francisco, Jassey-Bass Inc.

APPENDIX

This questionnaire has been prepared to obtain the views of academic vice presidents, and officers concerned with student affairs, on the aspect of student involvement in areas of university/college administration. The questionnaire does not cover every single area of governance, but an attempt has been made to enlist those which seem to be more significant as related to students and their association with their institutions. The instrument is designed to enlist two types of responses in questions II, III and IV. Under (I) what the institution policy is as perceived by the respondent and under (II) the respondent's own personal views on what the policy should be. Questions I and V require only a single response. Your cooperation is gratefully solicited.

PART I

Please check ONE of the following statements that comes closest to your opinion regarding role of students in campus affairs:

- (1) _____ Student activities should generally be confined to their studies and class assignments
- (2) _____ In addition to 1 above students should also participate in programs organized by official bodies of the institution, such as, departments and dean of students
- (3) _____ Besides 1 and 2 students should be allowed and encouraged to organize and participate in student government
- (4) _____ In addition to 1, 2 and 3 students should be free to take part in a variety of student activities organized both on and off campus
- (5) _____ In addition to all the above, students should be involved as partners in total university/college governance

PART II

Use the following five point scale as the criteria and indicate the extent of student involvement in each of the four areas A, B, C and D by circling the corresponding number in the two columns marked (1) university/college policy and (2) your own view on what the policy should be.

- CRITERIA
1. No participation in any capacity
 2. Attendance at the meetings as an observer to listen to the deliberations only
 3. Membership with the privilege of discussion only on matters pertaining to students
 4. Membership with the privilege of discussion and making motions on all issues but no right to vote.
 5. Membership with all the privileges of discussion and making motions on all issues with right to vote

AREAS	(1) University/College Policy					(2) Your Own View on What the Policy should be				
	No Participation	As an Observer	Discussion Pri- vilege	Discussion, Mo- tion, No vote	All privileges & right to vote	No Participation	As an Observer	Discussion Pri- vilege	Discussion, Mo- tion, no vote	All privileges & right to vote
A. Administration:										
(i) Board of Trustees/Board of Higher Education	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Administrative Council	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Faculty Senate	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Standing Committees:										
a. Admission Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b. Curriculum Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c. Discipline Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
d. Departmental Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
e. Rules and Procedures Committees	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Program Coordinating Council	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(vi) University Budget Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

(i) Planning Committees on:										
a. Curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
b. Academic Calendar	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
c. Degree Requirements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Teacher Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Student Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

C. Athletics and Extra Curricular:

(i) Interscholastic Athletics and Sports Council	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Musical and Theatrical Committees	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Committee on Intramurals	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Committee on Tours	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

D. Student Government, Student Control and Auxiliary Services:

(i) Student Union Finance Body	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Student Press and Publication Council	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Student Council	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Student Organizations, such as S.D.S., Black Students Union, Fraternities & Sororities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Student Housing Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(vi) Dormitory Rules Committee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(vii) Committee on Cafeteria and Meals	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(viii) Campus Security Body	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

PART III

How much freedom does your University/College allow students, and how much do you think you would like to allow them in the activities identified in the items listed below. Please use the following scale and indicate by circling the number against each item in both the columns.

- SCALE
- 1. No freedom
 - 2. A little freedom
 - 3. Some freedom
 - 4. Considerable freedom
 - 5. Complete freedom

ITEMS

	(1) Freedom that Institution allows					(2) Freedom that you would like to allow				
	No freedom	A little freedom	Some freedom	Considerable freedom	Complete freedom	No freedom	A little freedom	Some freedom	Considerable freedom	Complete freedom
(i) Class Attendance	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Planning a field of study	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Selection of criteria of evaluation of student performance	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Student Newspaper	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Student Union programs	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(vi) Student dress	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(vii) Dormitory hours	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(viii) Eligibility to run for Student Body Office	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

(ix) R.O.T.C. and Physical Education program	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(x) Fraternity and Sorority activities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(xi) Inviting outside speakers on campus	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(xii) Peaceful protest against National, State and Local political and social issues	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(xiii) Peaceful protest against institutional policies	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

PART IV

How much autonomy does your institution give to the students in the use and control of student activity fund money, and how much autonomy do you think you would like to give? Please use the following scale and circle the number of your answer against each item.

SCALE

1. No autonomy
2. A little autonomy
3. Some autonomy
4. Considerable autonomy
5. Complete autonomy

ITEMS	Autonomy that the institution gives					Autonomy that you would like to give				
	No autonomy	A little autonomy	Some autonomy	Considerable autonomy	Complete autonomy	No autonomy	A little autonomy	Some autonomy	Considerable autonomy	Complete autonomy
(i) Allocation of funds for student press and publication	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Allocation of funds for intramural activities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iii) Allocation of funds for educational and other tours	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(iv) Funds for inviting outside groups and individuals on campus	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Funds for running Student Government	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

PART V

Do you feel that a greater involvement of students in different areas of institutional governance will ease the problem of student demonstrations on the campus? Indicate your answer by checking one of the following:

1. Not at all _____
2. A little _____
3. To some extent _____
4. Considerably _____
5. Completely _____

Thank you very much.

Your designation _____

Name and Address of _____
the Institution _____

VITA

Elliot A. Chand

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Dissertation: Student Involvement in the Governance of Institutions of Higher Education and the Campus Unrest

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Ajmer, Rajasthan, India, January 20, 1920; son of Revd. and Mrs. Asa Chand; married Beulah Shireen Nilkanth, May 24, 1951; two daughters, Deepika Eleanor and Renuka Ruth.

Education: Undergraduate work at Maharajah's College Jaipur, Rajasthan, India and Forman Christian College, Lahore, (now in Pakistan) and graduated in 1946; Bachelor of Teaching degree from Teachers Training College, Ajmer, Rajasthan in 1949; Master of Science in Social Services from Boston University School of Social Work, 1954; Master of Arts degree in Geography from Boston University Graduate School, Boston, Mass, 1956; Master of Arts in Economics from Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U. P., India, 1961; Completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Administration at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1973.

Professional Experience: High school English, Economics and Social Studies Teachers, 1949-1952; Lecturer in Geography, Central Institute of Education, Ministry of Education, Government of India, Delhi, India, 1955-1957; Lecturer in Social Studies, Teachers College, Jamia Millia Islamia (National University), New Delhi, India, 1957-1959; Principal, High School, Directorate of Education, Delhi, Administration, 1959-1966; Lecturer, State Institute of Education, Directorate of Education, Delhi Administration, 1966-1968.